

1-1-2007

Homeland Security and Community Policing: Competing or Complementing Public Safety Policies

Robert R. Friedmann
Georgia State University, friedmann@gsu.edu

William J. Cannon
Georgia State University, wcannon1@student.gsu.edu

Recommended Citation

Friedmann, Robert R. and Cannon, William J. (2007) "Homeland Security and Community Policing: Competing or Complementing Public Safety Policies," *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management*: Vol. 4 : Iss. 4, Article 2.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Criminal Justice at Digital Archive @ GSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Criminal Justice Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Digital Archive @ GSU. For more information, please contact digitalarchive@gsu.edu.

Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management

Volume 4, Issue 4

2007

Article 2

Homeland Security and Community Policing: Competing or Complementing Public Safety Policies

Robert R. Friedmann*

William J. Cannon†

*Georgia State University, friedmann@gsu.edu

†Georgia State University, j_cannon10482@yahoo.com

Homeland Security and Community Policing: Competing or Complementing Public Safety Policies

Robert R. Friedmann and William J. Cannon

Abstract

In the aftermath of the September 11, 2001, terrorist atrocities in the United States, a new organizational policy was introduced as “Homeland Security.” Both a concept and a governmental department, homeland security became the “in” policy, and as such invented a new organization and a new approach to public safety. As a result, however, the dominant policing policy up to that time — Community Policing — was largely sidestepped by homeland security efforts as well as budgets. The purpose of this article is to demonstrate that the two public safety policies actually have a great deal in common, and that homeland security is to benefit from integrating principles of community policing in its localized strategies.

KEYWORDS: homeland security, community policing, public safety

Introduction

In recent years, a great deal of effort has been invested in redirecting the role of law enforcement to protecting life and property from a multitude of internal and external threats. Homeland security policy contends that, on the local level, information gathering, coordination with state and federal agencies, infrastructure protection, and enhanced development of police-community relationships will facilitate prevention, and aid response to potential terrorist attacks (Thacher, 2005; Ball, 2005; Hickman & Reaves, 2003; Caruson, 2005). However, the novelty of concepts under the homeland security paradigm can be at least partially traced to the model of community policing. Indeed, it can be safely argued that for policing, homeland security responsibilities arrived suddenly as a single substitute to the dominance of community policing.

Even though the majority of homeland security constructs have been developed predominantly in the post-September 11th atmosphere, minimal attention has been paid to the propositions contained within the community-policing model. Homeland security was seen as a self-standing, all-encompassing approach to the provision of public safety. Many have failed to recognize how homeland security and community policing overlap in certain principles concerning local law enforcement and its role of providing communities with protection and security. This failure is more by omission than by purpose. The realization of the value that community policing holds for homeland security should lead to its incorporation as a key element in the provision of homeland security.

Therefore, it is the goal of this article to explore the homeland security and community policing paradigms, conceptually and operationally, and ascertain the degree to which similarities are present in their implementation of various policies and practices. In doing so it is hoped that better clarity is offered about what these approaches contain and how they may overlap rather than be viewed as being mutually exclusive policies and practices. In doing so it is hoped that governmental and public partnerships, based upon the community policing paradigm, will better enhance public safety while also reducing crime and the likelihood of a terrorist attack. This is pertinent to public safety policy so as it points to the need to avoid duplication of efforts and recognizes the advantages of pre-existing efforts.

Domestic homeland security policy has emerged in the aftermath of the terrorist atrocities against New York City and Washington D.C. and has been evolving ever since. Attacking the very essence of American society - in its homeland - the 9/11 terrorists caused mass disruption by targeting "open, unprotected spaces

populated by a large, socially diverse workforce” (Eisinger, 2004, p. 116). In the aftermath of these attacks, law enforcement agencies began to view integration and information-sharing between various levels of government (state, federal, municipal) as a necessity for successful police deployment (Russo & Labriola, 2003 p. 29). In retrospect this is of little surprise, given that such coordination was found lacking.

Since the federal government also became aware of this need, a number of increased coordination procedures were included in the formation of the Department of Homeland Security. Encompassing a variety of functions and responsibilities, the DHS has recognized the value of local police forces, and has supported these agencies through increased training and monetary funding. For example, over \$3 billion worth of funding had been allocated to state and local programs through the DHS, with \$400 million going directly to support law enforcement terrorism prevention grants (Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2005). With such an emphasis on collecting information concerning potential terrorist threats, law enforcement agencies are now “fulfilling a new enhanced role” (Hickman & Reaves, 2003, p. 26) as first responders and primary gatherers of intelligence.

The principles of community policing have traditionally emphasized the dimensions of proactive policing, problem-solving, and community partnerships and cooperation. However, for both researchers and practitioners, there has been much debate of the principles, mechanisms, and value of community policing (Xu et al., 2005). Friedmann (1992) maintained that community policing is a philosophy and strategy that seeks: a) department-wide utilization; b) a proactive dimension to policing; c) improved relationships with citizens; d) stability between human and technological components; and e) focus on decentralization. Community policing has also been viewed as a tool with which to restore public order in communities. Effective law enforcement, as argued by Friedmann (1992), should eradicate the causes of crime by altering those social conditions that are found to spawn delinquency and deviant behavior. Other common principles under this construct include: information gathering (from both officers and community volunteers), order maintenance, and victim-support initiatives.

In analyzing the connection between homeland security and community policing, this article explores the interrelationship between two contemporary law enforcement policies that aim to provide better public safety. Furthermore, we investigate whether the fundamental propositions of each policy share similarities in both the conceptual and implementation levels. Few have attempted to compare and contrast these concepts; as the prominence of domestic safety policy has effectively highlighted homeland security, the community policing approach has been largely de-emphasized. Exploring the connection between federal and local policy prevention and response approaches to terrorist attacks or natural disasters reveals noteworthy commonalities between homeland security and community policing. Finally, it is

argued that the desired role of local law enforcement in homeland security policy is more fully realized when an agency employs community-policing principles as an integral part of its homeland security efforts.

The Nature of Terrorism

While terrorist factions differ in both ideological and structural composition, the goals and objectives of these organizations share one common element: spreading fear through the utilization of overt, criminal methods to achieve some political goal(s) (Ganor, 2007). In particular, terrorist activities in the post-9/11 era have focused on illegal means to incite feelings of fear, anxiety, and anger by attacking civilian targets (West & Orr, 2005). To further understand the complex nature of this violent activity, McVey (2003) lists five fundamental elements that characterize contemporary terrorism. First, terrorism, in every form, is *criminal in nature*. Through the organizing of terrorist cells, along with planning and completing ominous acts against government and commercial targets, both national and international criminal codes are violated.

The second and third elements, *political goals* and *symbolic targets*, signify how those involved in terrorism seek to attack their victims both emotionally and psychologically (McVey, 2003). In particular, the retaining of political motives has a three-fold purpose: a) terrorist attacks are meant to represent, and oftentimes strengthen, the determination of a certain political faction; b) attacks are aimed at a political adversary, who on average is in a position of economic or military superiority; and c) the effects of a terrorist attack often invoke feelings of fear, empathy, or encouragement from other nations or political groups that have no direct involvement with the issue itself. The fourth element, *aggressive and violent actions*, represents the criminal aspect of terrorist behavior. Through these hostile actions, terrorism functions as an open assault on an adversary's citizens and structures. Lastly, McVey holds that the underlying purpose of terrorism is to *communicate*. By criminal and violent means, terrorists strike out at political and symbolic targets so as to convey the dissatisfaction and hatred they have towards an identified enemy.

The threat of terrorism in the post-9/11 environment has led citizens to demand increased government protection in the form of defense and security funding (West & Orr, 2005). Since terrorist threats have major budgetary consequences for both national and local officials effort must be made to uncover how terrorist cells function (West & Orr, 2005). To better understand the manner in which terrorists operate, it is necessary to discuss the varying management and leadership structures found in these units. Dishman (2005), who classifies terrorist organizations into three types, focuses on how the flattening of modern-day terrorist cells has created new opportunities for partnership between crime and terrorism. First, *hierarchal*

units are structured along a strict chain-of-command, while also utilizing a high degree of direct leadership. With a more direct approach, leaders within this model attempt to ensure that the group's activities will ultimately support its aims and objectives (Dishman, 2005).

The second form, *decentralized cell structure*, is characterized by minimal top-down supervision, with continual communication between numerous mid-level officers. From an absence of structured leadership, the terrorist unit's overall goal is guaranteed only by the effectiveness of member interaction. The highest degree of decentralization is found in the final category of terrorist organization, *leaderless resistance*. In this form, those involved in a terrorist unit are motivated by recognized ideological goals (Dishman, 2005). Religious and philosophical beliefs guide the coordination of attacks through various principles that promote aggression towards those who either refuse to believe, or those who hold to a separate, and oftentimes conflicting, ideology. This autonomy allows individuals, and small cells, to engage in both terrorist and criminal activities.

In sum, the purpose of terrorism is to incite fear through the use of violent and criminal pursuits (Dishman, 2005; McVey, 2003; West & Orr, 2005). A terrorist attack serves as a message of hostility from one group to another, often stemming from religious differences, sheer political power, or both. Most importantly, terrorism is distinguished as a form of criminal behavior. Separation of terrorism and crime, although historically accepted, weakens efforts of investigation and prevention, as well as the effectiveness of government response. Furthermore, Dishman (2005) argued that this disconnection would hinder the identification and arrest of those affiliated with a terrorist group. This is particularly relevant when the symbiotic relationship between terrorist networks and traditional criminal networks are considered

However, the continuous movement and evolution of terrorist factions limit the degree in which standardized practices can combat terrorism. In particular, the current decentralized nature of these organizations necessitates a response capable of development and adaptation. These concerns pertain to the recruitment of terrorists, their training, their planning of and carrying out of terror acts. In summary it is advantageous for law enforcement organizations to acknowledge the criminal nature of terrorism. In the routine processing of criminal cases, local police regularly collect vital information that, when analyzed properly, can uncover the presence of terrorism. Yet, terrorism must not be limited to the criminal justice system; community, business, and government entities are needed for effective prevention and recovery efforts.

Homeland Security

Established in March 2003, the Department of Homeland Security has been one of the three largest departments in federal government, following what constituted the most extensive administrative reorganization in the last fifty years. The DHS was created by recognizing the need for enhanced coordination among state and municipal agencies in the fight against both local and international terrorism (Moynihan, 2005). Researchers and practitioners have recognized that law enforcement is a critical element in preventing terrorism across the nation. According to Lyons (2002), all law enforcement agencies, including local police departments, are now faced with “new and powerful pressures” in reaction to the nation’s progression into operating in a “War on Terror” environment. As a result, federal funding through the DHS has provided state and local agencies monetary support for equipment, training, and exercises to augment preparedness for major emergencies (Department of Homeland Security Appropriations for Fiscal Year, 2006). Seeing that local governments are charged with the security of individual territories, it is argued that they must successfully manage information regarding threats, vulnerabilities, and incidents related to domestic terrorism (Thacher, 2005; United States Government Accountability Office, 2006).

Central Aspects. The passage of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 charged the Department of Homeland Security with four key tasks that were designated as “critical” for American safety and security (United States Government Accountability Office, 2006):

- to develop a comprehensive national plan for ensuring safety for key U.S. assets and infrastructures
- to recommend defensive measures for U.S. resources
- to access, receive, and analyze local and national intelligence sources, and
- to distribute useful information to state and local organizations (United States Government Accountability Office, 2006).

Within the homeland security framework, law enforcement is expected to adapt in ways that correspond with the goals of DHS. For this first responder community, researchers, public officials, and law enforcement personnel have identified various initiatives that, if implemented properly, will further protect local communities, while enhancing the effectiveness of homeland security policy. In particular, local government can meet homeland security expectations by expanding its collection of intelligence; cooperation with local, state, federal entities; community-police relationships; and scope in responding to terrorist or other domestic emergencies.

A persistent outlook of the war on terror is that victory can be achieved only through success in the gathering of vital, security-related information (Lyons, 2002). Individuals in the homeland security environment anticipate local police will develop new areas of investigative expertise, increase the level of surveillance on their communities, and center their operations on securing key infrastructures (Thacher, 2005). Law enforcement agencies, which are in continuous contact with known and unknown residents, are believed to be capable of generating large amounts of information related to domestic security threats. In distinguishing between various forms of information-gathering systems, Nunn (2005) sorted these organizations into three categories: scanners (gatherers of general information), watchers (investigators of specific people, places, and events), and synthesizers (interpreters of data). Proponents of homeland security anticipate that law enforcement agencies, which generally perform tasks under the “scanner” role, will begin to include specific information gathering and interpretation (Nunn, 2005). Information collection and analysis, it is believed, will serve as a tool of prevention against threats to homeland security by detecting terrorist preparations in earlier stages. Law enforcement agencies at all levels, working in this new capacity, can effectively thwart attacks (both inside and outside their jurisdiction) by sharing information and opening paths of communication.

Being on the front lines of homeland security, regional police departments meet the requirements of homeland security policy by successfully coordinating with separate state, local, and national government agencies (Flynt & Olin, 2003). Furthermore, it is argued that law enforcement’s ability to share security-related information will benefit not only these three levels of government, but those in the international and private sectors as well (United States Government Accountability Office, 2006). Multi-level, inter-agency coordination consists of various processes and components that either augment or restrict successful implementation. Effective information sharing requires that local and federal lines of communication be unencumbered by coordination failure. This interaction is improved by the openness and willingness of agencies to transmit information at each level of government. For instance, if a police agency discovers information about a potential terrorist attack in another region of the country, successful prevention is reliant upon how swift and clear the established modes of communication are in place. Homeland security policy and objectives are further strengthened when joint efforts are coordinated at each level of government (Gerber et al., 2005). In particular, the DHS’s goal of identifying and preventing terrorist plots is argued to be contingent on how well the first responder community - at the local level - disseminates information to federal and state agencies.

In the atmosphere of domestic security some suggest that local law enforcement is required to “fundamentally reevaluate” the manner in which it

coordinates with individuals in the community (Flynt & Olin, 2003, p. 34). Although the fundamental purpose of government is to provide safety and security to its citizens, the current situation necessitates increased cooperation between law enforcement and U.S. civilians (Flynn, 2004). Furthermore, Hickman and Reaves (2003) maintain that the added value of local police to homeland security is measured by the extent to which officers establish, maintain, and record interactions with those in their jurisdiction. Pooling resources from the community enhances an area's level of protection by the link developed between citizens and government. Through the formation of these partnerships, it is believed that law enforcement will satisfy homeland security responsibilities by encouraging citizen participation, which can exhibit informal social control and surveillance in the prevention and detection of terrorist attacks.

Law enforcement response to terrorist attacks or natural disasters is perhaps one of most fundamental requirements within the homeland security paradigm yet not always carried out as expected. For example, first respondents in New York City, attempting to respond to the World Trade Center attacks, were ill-prepared to deal with the arduous tasks of evacuating residents, sheltering and aiding victims, conducting search and rescue operations, and initiating recovery efforts (Flynn, 2004; Waugh, 2006). Since local government is typically the first to respond, homeland security officials have recognized that successful outcome is affected by the manner in which this community reacts to an attack. In particular, municipal governments perform a variety of vital homeland security functions, including: "emergency first response, protection of critical infrastructures, public health readiness and remediation, public notification of threats, and law enforcement" (Gerber et al., 2005, p. 182). Even though the likelihood of a terrorist attack is minimal for most jurisdictions, clear and operational response procedures and mechanisms serve to enhance homeland security effectiveness, while also attending to the safety of local governments and communities.

Specifically, in the homeland security context, municipal and county police are often viewed as the primary responders to nearly all forms of catastrophes (O'Hanlon, 2006) while fire departments usually have primary jurisdiction over the scene. To better serve this purpose, it is argued that regional governments should seek to improve their: a) information gathering, b) collaboration with local, state, federal agencies, c) level of community involvement, and d) responsiveness to potential attacks and disasters. However, a connection exists among these four areas. That is, achievement in homeland security is dependant upon how effectual local government is at implementing initiatives related to the aforementioned areas. Numerous reports indicate that a vital aspect in U.S. security policy is the ability of local, state and federal agencies to plan a successful response to terrorist attacks (Gerber et al., 2005). The typical responsibilities of law enforcement include aspects

encompassing all four fundamental areas. The degree of success (or failure) of one initiative is argued to directly affect the accomplishment of other law enforcement-security efforts. However, as local police departments fulfill the tasks of homeland security policy, a number of obstacles and shortcomings have been found to plague the implementation of both federal and local programs.

Shortcomings. In recent years, the Department of Homeland Security's expectations for state and municipal law enforcement have been limited by implementation and design failures. For example, purchasing of inappropriate or questionable equipment or the porous security at airport and lack of sufficient security at sea ports, train stations and truck depots. Coupled with this limitation is the fact that U.S. police departments differ considerably in management styles, operation, standardized objectives, and information collection (Nunn, 2005). However, there are certain problems that have been identified as common in law enforcement's attempt to incorporate into their mission elements of homeland security.

Proper funding is an issue that has plagued government's fulfillment of domestic security goals prior to the inception of the DHS. In particular, funding becomes problematic when examining the allocation, management, and shortage of distribution. Many departments are receiving funds that they have little use for, while others must withstand shortages in monetary support from federal sources. O'Hanlon (2006) presented an example of funding chemical protective gear which is improperly distributed when federal agencies attempt to equip all of America's first responders. Instances, such as these, limit the effectiveness of homeland security by failing to properly assign local governments with funding that meets their security needs. As a result, many have argued that there is little likelihood that homeland security strategies will be applied consistently throughout the United States (Gerber et al., 2005; Thacher, 2005).

The effects of law enforcement information gathering and community collaboration, within the homeland security landscape, have resulted in inaccurate perceptions of unfairness, prejudice, and hostility. In particular, people who share ethnic, religious, and immigrant resemblance with individuals involved in terrorist organizations may feel threatened by enhanced police surveillance (Cainkar, 2004; Thacher, 2005). As noted by Cainkar (2004), Arab and Muslim communities commonly feel that they are recipients of negative reprisals in the form of "hate crimes, defamatory speech, and job discrimination" (p. 222). These groups have not been the sole targets of discrimination, but as homeland security and law enforcement efforts have increased, Muslim and Arab advocacy groups have reported perceptions that such practices unfairly target these communities. Thus, the varying perceptions of domestic security policies by these groups have resulted in limited success in intelligence collection and neighborhood cooperation.

An issue that has gained much attention from both citizens and those involved in crafting legislation is the threat to personal liberty that stems from certain homeland security initiatives. If domestic security principles are inappropriately applied, a conflict will arise between constitutional freedoms and state safety. In addition, the U.S. economic system will face setbacks when safety measures are enacted that hamper the process of marketplace economy (Flynn, 2004). Since the ratification of the Patriot Act and DHS, certain reactions to federal government policies have claimed that the state has overstepped its legitimate authority in the mission to secure American citizens and infrastructure (Cainkar, 2004). Although safety and protection are each essential elements within homeland security, it is the responsibility of federal, state, and local government to ensure that all methods of implementation are done so in accordance with constitutional rights and freedoms.

Several barriers hinder coordination effectiveness among local law enforcement, the federal government, and state agencies. For one, the decentralization of American police complicates any joint effort in preventing or responding to terrorist attacks (Gerber et al., 2005). With thousands of state, municipal, and county police departments, efforts at synchronization, according to Gerber et al. (2005), are obstructed by:

Intergovernmental and intragovernmental coordination difficulties, a lack of federal direction to state and local government regarding proper preparedness standards, conflicts between state and local government over the control and management of federal grants, and the possibility that homeland security concerns might disrupt, rather than enhance, local policy networks involved with emergency management systems (p. 183).

Another concern deals with the complexities surrounding crisis and response management. In particular, local police departments must tackle intricate domestic security legislation with minimal training, organizational limitations, and technical and physical isolation from federal and state agencies. Critics of homeland security maintain that it is presently lacking in universal communication, collective frameworks, and institutionalized relationships (Gerber et al., 2005).

Tom Ridge, in his acceptance of his appointment as Secretary of Homeland Security, stated “When our *hometowns* are secure, our *homeland* will be secure” (Ball, 2005). This statement acknowledges that domestic security is in large part within the power of state and local government. From 2001 to 2005, federal funding to the first responder community increased from \$616 million to \$3.4 billion (Friedman, 2005). Furthermore, in 2006, the DHS noted the importance of enhancing “communications interoperability, catastrophe planning, weapons of mass destruction (WMD) awareness, critical infrastructure protection, and cross-jurisdiction/regional cooperation and interaction” (Department of Homeland Security

Appropriations, 2006, p. 131). Several of these issues were featured in the aforementioned discussion of key areas related to local government's role in domestic security. However, the implementation obstacles encountering these factors have softened, and oftentimes completely diminished success as identified by homeland security practitioners. Thought to be in its infant stage, local and state agencies have in reality been on the vanguard of counter-terrorism and natural disasters response long before the initiation of the Department of Homeland Security. All told, effective law enforcement preparation, management, and responsiveness to terrorist attacks and natural disasters, although officially regulated by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, significantly influence foreign and domestic security for the American people.

Community Policing

Key Principles. In the community-policing framework law enforcement provides more than traditional reactive police services in that it means the expansion in both number and nature of proactive police services to the community (Scheider & Chapman, 2003). Through this evolution in crime prevention, law enforcement takes a more comprehensive approach by utilizing quality of life initiatives that target the root causes of criminal activity (Xu et al., 2005). As noted by Friedmann (1992), community policing is also expected to employ formal and informal community social control mechanisms to prevent and contain delinquency by relying on the community itself to co-produce public safety. While community-policing designs have been implemented in various departments across the nation, there are certain general principles in which the majority of these initiatives adhere to.

Effective law enforcement is intended to utilize problem-solving techniques in order to proactively combat crime and delinquency. Proactive policing addresses the social conditions of crime; wherein law enforcement attempt to eliminate sources of crime by focusing on poverty and other socio-economic factors that appear to be positively correlated with elevated crime rates (Xu et al., 2005). As the daily routine of an officer seldom involves direct prevention and management of crime, community-policing departments focus on the underlying conditions that generate crime and disorder (Friedmann, 1992; Scheider & Chapman, 2003). This is achieved through problem identification and analysis, and by developing customized tactics that concentrate on "deterring offenders, protecting likely victims, and making locations less conducive to crime and disorder" (Scheider & Chapman, 2003, p. 3). The philosophy and strategy of community policing seeks to depart from the traditional approach of solely reacting to crime incidents by calling upon both proactive and reactive measures in an attempt to eradicate - or minimize - the fundamental roots of criminal behavior.

A second key assumption of community policing is that law enforcement agencies will improve their level of service by forging partnerships with those identified as “external” to the police organization. External entities consist of community members, local businesses, and various other municipal and state institutions that may have interest in the overall mission of the agency. These partnerships act as a force-multiplier for local and state law enforcement: encouraging information sharing, involving all types of citizens, and developing citizen participation at each stage in the problem-solving process (Lyons, 2002). For instance, many community-policing agendas have spotlighted neighborhood watch organizations in an effort to bring together the differing perspectives of community crime and disorder. Through this process, it is hoped that those with negative experiences will voice their concerns about law enforcement, as well as their perceptions of how safe and secure their neighborhoods are.

Furthermore, this strategy incorporates departmental partnership with other government and social service agencies, so that a joint effort will undertake the identification and management of continual problems within the community (Scheider & Chapman, 2003). Each law enforcement-community partnership is expected to rebuild citizen trust of the police, activate the informal social control processes that contribute to deviance prevention, and allow police access to the various information rooted in their jurisdictions (Lyons, 2002). Although the main purpose of these relationships is to incorporate citizens into the crime prevention process, such alliances are anticipated to re-invent the informal surveillance and social control that, in past years, served to monitor and impede the development of serious criminal activity. Along these lines, the White House initiated one such national effort post 9-11 known as Volunteers in Police Service (VIPS) which was part of the USA Freedom Corps (USAFC).

In order to effectively implement a community policing strategy, some argue that police departments must undergo significant modifications in order to accomplish the principal mission. Namely, all members across the police department must adopt community-policing principles (Friedmann, 1992). Furthermore, a strategy that is reflected through department-wide involvement, and that is visible in the organization’s “mission, goals, objectives, performance evaluations, hiring and promotion practices, training, and all other systems” (Scheider & Chapman, 2003, p. 2) will achieve implementation success and longevity. In addition, departments that utilize community policing, in an attempt to build trust and enhance safety, systematically assign officers to designated areas within their jurisdiction. The purpose of appointing officers to specific beats is to improve police service, officer sensitivity, communication with residents, and accountability to the citizens in the area (Friedmann, 1992; Scheider & Chapman, 2003). Lastly, a COP agenda focuses on decentralization of the department itself. The organization will witness a

flattening of the hierarchal structure; wherein police management will distribute decision-making authority to lower-level officers, who in turn will be made more accountable for the services they provide (Scheider & Chapman, 2003).

In sum, the purpose of community policing is to provide an enhanced service to the community by having citizens participate in the production of public safety (Whitaker, 1980). Furthermore, this strategy defines superior police work as meeting citizens' needs and expectations, with an additional focus on improving quality of life and decreasing fear of crime (Xu et al., 2005). In a sense, it also provides a better understanding of how crime is generated and what is the appropriate police intervention to have an impact on it. To achieve these objectives, police are encouraged to form more reciprocal relationships with the public, utilize traditional and non-traditional problem solving methods to prevent crime, and rearrange the department's structure to transfer accountability and responsibility to individual officers in the process of their duties (Lyons, 2002; Scheider & Chapman, 2003). Even though law enforcement has traditionally maintained the sole objective of crime control, community-oriented policing refocuses this position by adjusting the nature of police work to highlight, and address, the causes of criminal behavior.

Community Policing and Homeland Security

The advent of homeland security resulted in sidestepping the prevalence of community policing as a law enforcement policy. This occurred due to the perceived urgency of the need to address future threats, the overwhelming shock the nation has suffered, the adoption of costly technology and equipment, and the tendency to concentrate all efforts on this new challenge of an unprecedented magnitude. Thus homeland security had immediate, clear and definable needs to protect people and property while community policing was - and still is - perceived more as a soft and complex approach. Perhaps the key reason for this policy replacement is rooted in the comprehensive public safety nature of homeland security while community policing remained more limited in its focus on crime and fear of crime.

Homeland security emerged abruptly in reaction to a clearly defined terrorist atrocity that required immediate reaction and preparedness for additional attacks, community policing has evolved as part of the development and progression of the policing movement. Homeland security emerged out of external pressures while community policing evolved gradually through internal recognition by police leadership of the limitation of reactive policing measure that were in place; they understood the potential benefits of addressing sources of crime as a precursor to reducing crime. Yet, it is apparent that the mission of homeland security shares several commonalities with community policing. The International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) recognized that the principles of COP not only enhance the

capabilities of law enforcement, but also supplement the achievements of public safety agencies, social service agencies, and the corporate community to include domestic security awareness of potential terrorist and non-terrorist criminal activity (IACP, 2002).

However, the most noticeable overlap between these two approaches relates to the manner in which they manage the prevention and response to crime and terrorism. As noted previously, terrorism is generally recognized as a criminal activity. Through this classification, the function of police departments coincides with the objectives of homeland security; that is, the prevention, detection, and eradication of criminal activity by way of effective law enforcement. When local police agencies employ a community-policing strategy, they not only satisfy the aims of domestic security, but also alleviate many of the known shortcomings that often plague these policies.

Overlapping Concepts. Homeland security and community policing strategies share a number of fundamental elements concerning the prevention of terrorist (criminal) activity. Each emphasizes the role of information gathering as being a key characteristic in crime prevention. As homeland security policies purport increased and enhanced “intelligence gathering and analytical capabilities” (Boderro, 2003), p. 39), community policing encourages the identification and analysis of information pertaining to future delinquent behavior (Lyons, 2002). Each takes a proactive approach to problem behavior; wherein the possibility of attack (crime) is thwarted through the utilization of non-traditional techniques. These techniques include the investigation of particular individuals suspected of being involved in terrorist activities, community safety through the protection of specific areas against terrorism, and the management of impending chemical, biological, and conventional threat analyses and their relative likelihood of occurrence (Davis, et al., 2004; Pelfrey, 2005; Thacher, 2005). Through these strategies, it is anticipated that the first responder community will have an increased capacity to thwart instances of crime and terrorism.

Both homeland security and community policing policies recognize the value of successful community cooperation. In direct connection with information gathering, each strategy believes effective collaboration will enhance terrorism/crime-related intelligence collection, while also generating improvements within the community itself. To attain high levels of data, the community-police relationship is meant to utilize trust, flexibility, openness, social capital, and numerous lines of information (Pelfrey, 2005). A shared goal of both COP and homeland security is that trust will be rebuilt and augmented within communities that have unpleasant histories with law enforcement. Although law enforcement lacks the capacity to reshape public opinion, it is able to build partnerships that can potentially improve the access to information regarding crime and terrorism (Lyons, 2002). In

addition, it is agreed that community support and citizen fear are each issues that can be modified through successful law enforcement collaboration. By encouraging citizen participation with various community programs (i.e. neighborhood watch, youth education), police departments can build cohesion among citizens, while also decreasing fear of crime and bestowing a certain degree of civil responsibility into the hands of the citizenry (Scheider & Chapman, 2003).

Lastly, partnership with other state and federal government institutions is a goal shared by both public safety approaches. Although each identifies a unique set of collaborative organizations, the underlying assumption is that law enforcement will improve its terrorism and/or crime prevention efforts by openness and cooperation with other government, law enforcement agencies, civic groups, and businesses. The contemporary threat of terrorism, coupled with criminal activity, compels local police to expand their collaborative efforts with various state and federal departments, with an emphasis on information sharing, crime analysis, and task force operations (Lyons, 2002).

Homeland security and community policing both recognize that in order to be successful, such relationships must be well constructed and in place prior to occurrence of severe criminal acts. Indeed, the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) adopted a resolution recognizing that community policing is an integral part of homeland security (IACP, 2002). Furthermore, both strategies point out that cooperation must be effectively integrated, accessible, and compatible with standard police practices (Runge, 2003). An even more important development is the formation of the National Incident Management System (NIMS) by President Bush in February 2003 “to enable Federal, State, local, and tribal governments and private-sector and nongovernmental organizations to work together effectively and efficiently to prepare for, prevent, respond to, and recover from domestic incidents, regardless of cause, size, or complexity, including acts of catastrophic terrorism.”

Through these external alliances, it is anticipated that information concerning crime and terror will be shared among various government institutions. Also, as partnerships function on a more permanent and structured basis, threats will be recognized and diffused without infringing upon citizens’ civil liberties. Therefore, it appears that homeland security and community policing are significantly inter-linked, and that at the very least the latter is integral to success in the former.

Although both homeland security and community policing policies are designed to thwart serious crime and terror, each maintains a similar conceptual design that centers on effective reaction and response to potential disasters and instances of serious criminal activity. Both strategies incorporate a traditional reactive function, alongside a proactive approach, in which they seek to utilize the bonds that are formed from partnerships with community and government agencies. As such, emphasis is placed upon coordinated efforts with local medical and private

enterprises. Wherein, effective recovery efforts include adequate resources, personnel, and expertise that concentrate on protecting people from harm, reducing harmful effects, controlling the event's impact, and identifying and arresting those responsible (Pelfrey, 2005). See Table 1 below for a summary comparison.

Table 1: Comparison of Homeland Security and Community Policing

	Homeland Security	Community Policing
Commonalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of information gathering as a preventive tool • Emphasis on cooperation between local, state and federal agencies • Work to build successful community partnerships • Utilize both proactive and reactive measures (with different emphases) • Designed to thwart serious crime and terror • Aim at enhancing public safety 	
Differences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centralized federal/state command • Information flows top down • Primarily first responder involvement • Standardized implementation • Specialized offices • Focus on man-made/natural disasters • Emphasis on sophisticated technology • Focus on prevention, mitigation, reaction • Emphasis on intelligence gathering • Created large federal/state bureaucracy • Government based and initiated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Command structure decentralized • Information flows laterally • Citizens play a key role • Adaptable to any location • Department-wide philosophy • Focus on minimizing crime • Emphasis on empowerment • Target crime-causing conditions • Emphasis on relation building • Focus still on localized programs • Grassroots and locally initiated

Through the expansion in police responsibilities, these initiatives are invaluable to the response and recovery phases of a terrorist (criminal) attack. In response to high levels of intergovernmental complexity, homeland security and community policing advocate the importance of bridging between local officials and their state and federal counterparts; wherein it is anticipated that first responders will be adequately prepared to perform their designated functions, while also securing assistance from community, state, and federal entities (Carusan et al., 2005).

Homeland Security Shortcomings. When attempting to compare the practical usefulness of homeland security and community policing strategies, it is apparent that community policing helps alleviate some of the limitations of homeland security. Although certain shortcomings are inherent in any government initiative (e.g. funding), there are several areas in which community-policing principles more fully realize the goals of homeland security. For example, there have been instances where homeland security policies appear to have brought about official and unofficial discrimination against African, Middle Eastern, and Islamic Americans (Cainkar, 2004). Whereas such legislation centers on the increased regulation of those

suspected of having terrorist connections, the implementation of these initiatives has unintentionally decreased the amount of trust these groups have in government (e.g. law enforcement). However, a fundamental assumption in community policing is that police must rebuild trust in communities that have lost confidence in local, state, and federal law enforcement. Restoring trust with Arab-American and Islamic-American communities accomplishes two interrelated objectives: it encourages the degree of neighborhood social cohesion, and allows police to establish and maintain relationships with those that may have greater access to information regarding potential crimes and terrorist plots.

Another criticism of homeland security policies is that they allow government to disregard certain civil liberties in the process of ensuring domestic safety and defense. Beginning with the attacks in 2001, a sense of urgency and moral panic developed that compelled public policy to alter the manner in which it prevents, prepares, and responds to serious large-scale attacks (Welch, 2003). Although perceived to be serious, there is no evidence that widespread constitutional infractions have resulted from homeland security policies, even if there are instances in which individuals have lost a certain degree of trust in their government. As a result, some are less willing to voluntarily initiate relationships with state and federal entities (Cainkar, 2004). However, some argue that the safeguards these policies provide are worth the negative effects of citizen distrust and concern.

Through community policing, citizens are encouraged to participate at every stage of the problem solving process (Lyons, 2002). Furthermore, a key principle for community policing is to allow communities an opportunity to voice not only concerns related to criminal activity, but also evaluations on officer and organizational performance. As noted previously, this strategy aims to build trust and reduce the level of fear citizens have in their communities. If a citizen feels they are victim of unlawful treatment by police or other community figures, joint neighborhood-police programs allow their voice to be heard, while also addressing the underlying causes that may have attributed to such behavior. The model of community policing, while focusing on increased safety and decreased fear of crime, also seeks to build cohesion within the region by incorporating citizen feedback and involvement.

Lastly, as homeland security seeks standardized implementation of domestic safety, community policing recognizes the assorted processes of American cities and their need for strategies that are able to evolve and adapt to a particular situation. The function of homeland security is to construct uniform initiatives that will find effectiveness in state and local governments across the U.S. As communities are composed of unique structures, characteristics, and problems, they require local police and government agencies to come up with an accommodating approach to these issues in an effective and efficient manner (Friedmann, 1992). The success of

incorporating community policing principles is found in both their ambiguity and certainty; while modifications can be made within each municipality, the fundamental elements of community policing direct and assist the short and long-term implementation of individual strategies. Although each policy recognizes that domestic security will differ across jurisdictions, only the basic components of community policing noticeably recognize the value in allowing adaptation at the local, state, and federal levels.

Discussion

Since 9/11 the community-policing model has been sidestepped because it is thought to be inoperable for effective domestic security and terrorist prevention, and because this new model has become an “ultimate” policy that has symbolically replaced community policing. However, as the evidence indicates, community policing accomplishes the goals of homeland security, while also alleviating the limitations that are commonly found in this contemporary policy. The nature of law enforcement places officers in situations where they could provide critical information on a terrorist cell or attack (Dishman, 2005). As such, community policing grants local police further information-gathering opportunities by actively involving the community and other state and federal agencies in the crime control/order maintenance process. Indeed, with proper implementation, community policing can result in building a solid intelligence base in the community. Municipal governments can successfully achieve dual goals when implementing a department-wide, community policing strategy: reducing local crime and delinquency, and satisfying effective domestic security needs. While crime may be widespread, and the likelihood of being involved in a terrorist attack, according to the U.S. Center for Disease Control, is 1 in 88,000 (Friedman, 2005), each pose a threat to American safety and security. To successfully confront these social problems, local police departments must employ community-policing principles in officer training, leadership and management supervision, enhancing community ties, and relevant departmental policies and objectives.

The prominence of homeland security policy has forced researchers and practitioners to question the manner in which local government provides safety and protection for its citizens. The current situation is one of numerous internal and external threats, which will likely seek out opportunities to assault non-military networks that “move people, food, cargo, energy, money, and info at high volumes and greater velocities” (Flynn, 2004, p. 5). A commonly held belief is that law enforcement can play a vital role in investigating and preventing future terrorist attacks (Runge, 2003). Through this article, the seemingly mutually exclusive

policies of homeland security and community policing have been analyzed and shown reciprocal benefits.

As homeland security has gained contemporary recognition in an atmosphere of terrorism and fear, community policing has increasingly been relegated to far lesser importance by local, state, and federal organizations. However, through examining these two strategies, evidence suggests that they share a number of overlapping principles. Furthermore, community policing has been shown to satisfy the central concepts found within homeland security; namely, a) extensive information gathering, b) collaboration with local, federal, and state agencies, c) community involvement, and d) the formation of inter-agency cooperation. The value of community policing is revealed in the ability of law enforcement agencies, of varying styles and sizes, to adapt to community realities. Policy makers at each level of government will achieve better terrorism prevention and response when they wholly adhere to integrating the community policing philosophy into the homeland security strategy.

References

- Ball, Howard. (2003). *U.S. Homeland Security*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO Inc.
- Bodrero, D.D. (2003). Preventing terrorist acts: A new challenge for law enforcement. In R.L. Kemp (Ed.), *Homeland security: Best practices for local government* (pp. 39-44). Washington, DC: International City/County Management Association.
- Cainkar, Louise. (2004). The impact of the September 11 attacks on Arab and Muslim communities in the United States. In J. Tirman (Ed.), *The maze of fear: Security and migration after 9/11*. (pp. 215-240). New York, NY: The New Press.
- Caruson, K., MacManus, S.A., Kohen, M., & Watson, T.A. (2005). Homeland security preparedness: The rebirth of regionalism. *Publius*, 35(1), 143-189.
- Davis, L.M., Riley, K.J., Ridgeway, G., Pace, J., Cotton, S.K., Steinberg, P.S., et al. (2004). *When terrorism hits home: How prepared are state and local law enforcement*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 118 STAT. 1298 (2005).
- Department of Homeland Security Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2006 Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate. 109th Congress., 1st Session., (2005), Retrieved August 20th, 2006 from <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/congress/index.html>.
- Dishman, Chris (2005). The leaderless nexus: When crime and terror converge. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, 28, 237-252.
- Eisinger, Peter. (2004). The American city in the age of terror: A preliminary

- assessment of the effects of September 11. *Urban Affairs Review*, 40(1), 115-130.
- Flynn, Stephen. (2004). *America the vulnerable: How our government is failing to protect us from terrorism*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers Inc.
- Flynt, B. & Olin, R. (2003). Community threat assessment: A model for police. In R.L. Kemp (Ed.), *Homeland security: Best practices for local government* (pp. 33-38). Washington, DC: International City/County Management Association.
- Friedman, B. (2005). Homeland Security. *Foreign Policy*, 149, 22-26.
- Friedmann, R. (1992). *Community policing: Comparative perspectives and prospects*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Ganor, B. (2007). *The counter-terrorism puzzle: A guide for decision makers*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Gerber, B.J., Cohen, D.B., Cannon, B., Patterson, D., Stewart, K. (2005). On the frontline: American cities and the challenge of homeland security preparedness. *Urban Affairs Review*, 41(2), 182-210.
- Hickman, M.J. & Reaves, B.A. (2003). Intelligence gathering and networking. In R.L. Kemp (Ed.), *Homeland security: Best practices for local government* (pp. 23-27). Washington, DC: International City/County Management Association.
- International Association of Chiefs of Police, 2002 Resolution. (2002). *Community policing - A valuable tool in the fight against terrorism*. Retrieved from http://www.theiacp.org/Resolutions/index.cfm?fuseaction=dis_public_view&resolution_id=196&CFID=10702&CFTOKEN=14477052.
- Lyons, William. (2002). Partnerships, information, and public safety: Community policing in a time of terror. *Policing*, 25(3), 530-542.
- McVey, P.M. (2003). The local role in fighting terrorism. In R.L. Kemp (Ed.), *Homeland security: Best practices for local government* (pp. 125-130). Washington, DC: International City/County Management Association.
- Methamphetamine Epidemic Elimination Act Hearing before the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives. 109th Congress., 1st Session., (2005) (Serial No. 109-61). Retrieved August 20th, 2006 from <http://judiciary.house.gov>.
- Moynihan, D.P. (2005). Homeland security and the U.S. public management policy agenda. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions*, 18(2), 171-196.
- Nunn, Sam. (2005). Preventing the next terrorist attack: The theory and practice of homeland security information systems. *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management*, 2(3), 1-28.
- O'Hanlon, M. (2006). The roles of D.O.D. and first responders. In M. d'Arcy, M.

- O'Hanlon, P., Orszag, J., Shapiro, J., & J. Steinberg (Eds.), *Protecting the Homeland 2006/2007* (pp. 113- 128). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Pelfrey, W. V. (2005). The cycle of preparedness: Establishing a framework to prepare for terrorist attacks. *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management*, 2(1), 2-21.
- Runge, J.W. (2003). Traffic law enforcement and homeland security. In R.L. Kemp (Ed.), *Homeland security: Best practices for local government* (pp. 45-48). Washington, DC: International City/County Management Association.
- Russo, J. & Labriola, D. (2003). Information sharing by local agencies. In R.L. Kemp (Ed.), *Homeland security: Best practices for local government* (pp. 29-32). Washington, DC: International City/County Management Association.
- Scheider, M. & Chapman, Robert. (2003, April). Community policing and terrorism. *Homeland Security Institute*. Retrieved August 31st, 2006, from <http://www.homelandsecurity.org/journal/articles/Scheider-Chapman.html>.
- Thacher, David. (2005). The local role in homeland security. *Law & Society*, 39(3), 635-676.
- United States General Accounting Office. (2003). Letter to Senator Thad Cochran, *Investigations of Terrorist Financing, Money Laundering, and Other Financial Crimes*. (GAO Publication-04-464R). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- United States Government Accountability Office. (2006). *Information Sharing: DHS Should Take Steps to Encourage More Widespread use of its Program to Protect and Share*. (GAO Publication-06-383). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Waugh, W.L. (2006). The political costs of failure in the Katrina and Rita disasters. *The Annals*, 604, 10-25.
- Welch, Michael. (2003). Trampling human rights in the war on terror: Implications to the sociology of denial. *Critical Criminology*, 12, 1-20.
- West, D.M., & Orr, M. (2005). Mitigating citizen fears: Public attitudes toward urban terrorism. *Urban Affairs Review*, 41(1), 93-105.
- Whitaker, Gordon. (1980). Coproduction: Citizen participation in service delivery. *Public Administrative Review*, 40(3), 204-246.
- Xu, Y., Fiedler, M.L., & Flaming, K.H. (2005). Discovering the impact of community policing: The broken windows thesis, collective efficacy, and citizens' judgment. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 42(2), 147-186.